



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,893	01/12/2002	Koteshwerrao Adusumilli	42390P12318X	3131

7590 04/24/2006

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,893	ADUSUMILLI, KOTESHWERRAO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher J. Brown	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 33-52 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 33-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see filed 2/3/2006, with respect to USC 112 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The USC 112 Rejection of claims 40, 42, 46, 48, 49, and 50 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's objection to Davis US 6,367,009 has been noted. The examiner has brought in new prior art in Stewart US 6,571,221.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art

date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 33, 34, 38, 42, 45, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart US 6,571,221.

As per claims 33, 42, and 50, Stewart teaches an interface to receive data from at least one wired client device and one wireless client device, (Col 8 lines 47-55). Stewart teaches logic to determine if the device is wired or wireless, (Col 7 lines 43-62, Col 8 lines 20-30). Stewart teaches requesting a secure connection from a wired or wireless device,(Col 13 lines 33-43). Stewart teaches that the client is authenticated in establishing a connection with the wired or wireless device, (Col 14 lines 29-44).

As per claim 34, Stewart teaches that the device has an interface to transmit data and to receive data from a server, (Col 14 lines 16-22).

As per claims 38, 45, and 52, Stewart teaches requesting a digital certificate of the client and authenticating that certificate, (Col 14 lines 19-22, 29-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2134

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35, 36, 40, 43, 48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Gast US 2003/0046532.

As per claims 35 and 43, Stewart fails to teach protocols but teaches wired, and wireless authentication, (Col 14 lines 29-44).

Gast teaches receiving an indication of a wired, SSL, or wireless, WTLS protocol header to determine type of cryptographic processing, [0030].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the wired and wireless protocols with the wired and wireless systems of Stewart because the wired and wireless devices are widely supported by such protocols.

As per claims 36, 40, 48 and 51, Stewart does not teach protocols or determining the client type dependent on protocol.

Gast teaches determining the type of protocol and network based on network protocol headers, [0030]. Gast teaches the use of SSL, and WTLS and that protocol types may be associated with wired and wireless networks, [0024], [0030].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Stewart with the SSL, and WTLS protocols of Gast because it improves the wireless security of the system.

Claims 37, 41, 44, 46, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Douglas US 2004/0010684

As per claims 37 and 44, Stewart fails to teach sending a certificate from the server to the client.

Douglas teaches a handshaking technique where the client and server exchange certifications and digital signatures to authenticate each other, [0031], [0032].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the handshaking technique of Douglas with the system of Stewart because it allows the client to authenticate the server thus ensuring that the client is not communicating with an unauthorized party.

As per claims 41, and 49, Stewart fails to teach receiving a digital signature from the client device and validating said signature.

Douglas teaches a handshaking technique where the client and server exchange certifications and digital signatures to authenticate each other, [0029], [0030] [0031].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the digital signatures of Douglas with the system of Stewart in order to confirm that data had not been manipulated in transit.

As per claim 46, Stewart fails to teach verifying the validity period of the certificate.

Douglas teaches including a timestamp in the signed message, and validating said message, [0028], [0029]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the timestamp of Douglas with the certificate of Stewart because it would prevent replay attacks [Douglas 0028].

Claims 39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Hajmiragha US 6,289,460

As per claims 39, and 47, Stewart does not teach using a URL with a digital certificate. Hajmiragha teaches sending a link, rather than the actual digital certificate, (Col 4 lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Stewart with the link of Hajmiragha, because the link prevents interception and modification of a digital certificate between parties.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jaques Louis Jaques can be reached on (571)272-6962. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

4/19/06



Jacqueline L. Gager
ACLUISH, LOUIS & GAGERS
FEDERAL BUSINESS CENTER